

## REMARKS

Claims 20 through 22, 26 through 31, 37, and 39 through 41 continue to be in the case.

Claims 1 through 19, 23 through 25, 32 through 36 and 38 are being cancelled.

Claims 20 and 26 are being amended.

Claims 1-19, 23-27, 32, 34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, lines 5-7, "guidable by the force of a spring (F) as seen from the removal direction of the denture under regions of a fixedly seated element (S)" is unclear. In claims 26, 34 and 38, a "second direction" is unclear because the claim has not defined a first direction. In claim 32, the claim defines a second basal limit before describing a first, and in lines 15 and 16, it is not clear how the flattenings can unlock the fixedly seated element for the fixedly seated element. Claims 1, 23-25 and 32 are indefinite because they recite a functional limitation of moving parts in a removal direction while failing to claim any actual structure capable of performing this function. Applicant is required to check all of the claims for general language problems in this application. All of the claims must be checked and placed in proper US form.

Claims 1 through 19, 23 through 25, 32 through 36 and 38 are being cancelled.

Claim 26 is being amended to eliminate the language calling for a second direction. No specific reason was give in the Office Action for a rejection of claim 27 under this paragraph.

Claims 23-25, 32-36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. These claims contain the limitation of "spring (F), the locking bar (R) and the pushbutton (D) become lifted". The original disclosure did not disclose or teach this limitation. The original disclosure appears to be directed to a fixed element (S) moving. Further, these claims appear to be implying that the stop faces claimed somehow move the elements, however, there is no teaching of this in the original disclosure.

Claims 1 through 19, 23 through 25, 32 through 36 and 38 are being cancelled.

*The Office Action refers to Drawings.*

The proposed drawing changes filed October 27, 2003 have not been approved because the copy of Fig. 2 was cut off in the region of numeral 12 rendering it impossible to evaluate the location of the numeral. With respect to newly proposed figures 22 and 23, it is noted that numeral 12 in Fig. 23 is out of place. Otherwise, in general, these figures appear to be okay, they cannot be properly evaluated until an accompanying amendment to the specification is submitted so that they can be evaluated for the presence of new matter. If applicant persists in amending the drawings and specification as describe, applicant must make a statement that the amendment do not contain new matter.

Applicant is submitting another copy of revised Fig. 2 for proper evaluation. As to Figs 22 and 23, applicant does not intend at this time to further pursue these Figs. 22 and 23 in connection with the present application.

*The Office Action refers to Claim Objections.*

In claim 20, forth line from the bottom, see "the the spring". In claims 23 and 24, line 12, see "engage able". In claim 25, lines 13, and 26, line 4, see "slid able". In claim 32, see unusual terminology, "flattenings"

The present amendment amends claims 20 and 26. Claims 23 through 25 and 32 are being cancelled.

*The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.*

Claims 1-19, 32-36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Romagnoli (4345901) in view of Weissman (4661069) or Sulc (5120222). Romagnoli shows a connecting element having a slidable locking bar 13, Fig. 5, spring 15 and push button 14. Romagnoli shows engagement elements 13a and groove 6. Elements 13a and 6 inherently comprise stop surfaces because the stop the elements from moving when engaged. Romagnoli does not state that the shown elements can function to allow for a slight lifting. Weissman teaches that bridge elements need to prevent movement of the elements, column 6, lines 11-24, and Sulc also teaches the need in the art to prevent movement, column 7, lines 44-50. It is further noted that it is well known in the art that a loose bridge is undesirable, and therefore, such connections are made to be tight. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Romagnoli to include a tight connection between elements 13a and 6 as suggested by Weissman or Sulc in order to prevent movement of the bridge. A tight connection between the elements inherently implies that surfaces of the elements are in opposed force engagement. As the engagement is released, the forces are released and the elements will inherently move away from each other. The claims

are only limited by the functional limitation of a slight lifting. The shown obvious structure is capable of functioning as claimed. The specific shape of the inferentially claimed denture or tooth or implant is given no patentable weight. The specific shape of the elements is an obvious matter of choice in the shape of known structure to the skilled artisan. As to claim 32, Romagnoli shows a fixed element 1, stop 6, locking device 12 having an inner surface that will stop the elements from moving and that has a locked position relative to 1, see Fig. 4 and a removal position relative to 1, see Fig. 5, a locking bar 13 having a holding surface 13a and a pushbutton 14. See combination with Weissman and Sulc above. As stated the combination will function to allow the elements to be lifted. To use flattenings for surface 13a is an obvious matter of choice in the shape of known elements to one of ordinary skill in the art. As to claims 35 and 36, to call the end 13a a bolt is an obvious matter of choice in terminology to the skilled artisan. As to claim 38, the method is obvious in view of the shown structure described above.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant is not able to argue this or to amend the claims apparently in view of limited funds.

*The Office action refers to Allowable Subject Matter.*

Claims 20-22, 27-31, 37, 39, 40 and 41 are allowed. Applicant very much appreciates the indication of allowability of these claims. Applicant believes that claim 26 stands without an art rejection and as amended should be in allowable form.

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs only.

Applicants very much appreciate the positive hint regarding claims 23 through 25, but apparently the funds of the applicant are too limited to work on overcoming this rejection.

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph only.

Claim 26 is being amended to become allowable.

Applicant submits that the prior art made of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious the present invention.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Stefan Wintermantel

By: *Horst M. Kasper*  
Horst M. Kasper, his attorney  
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059  
Telephone: (908)757-2839  
Telefax: (908)668-5262  
Reg.No. 28,559; Docket No.: DRN204

\*%pt1\PAMEND((rep/am